DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 227 CE 030 345

AUTHOR	Greenan, James P.
TITLE	Use of State Special Needs Set-Aside Funds for Program Improvement Activities. Policy Research and Resource Series: Document 8.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Univ., Urbana. Leadership Training Inst./Vocational and Special Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Special Education (ED), Washington, D.C. Div. of Personnel Preparation.
PUB DATE	Oct 81
GRANT	G007900952
NOTE	94p.; For related documents see CE 030 343-344, ED 194 743-745, and ED 201 745.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Abstracts; Agency Cooperation; *Demonstration Programs; *Disabilities; Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal State Relationship; Innovation; Program Development; *Program Improvement; Research; *Special Education; *Statewide Planning; *Vocational Education; Vocational Rehabilitation
IDENTIFIERS	Education Amendments 1976

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to examine the extent to which program improvement funds from Public Law 94-482 were used by states to aid state vocational education programs serving handicapped and disadvantaged students through research, exemplary and innovative programs, curriculum development, vocational guidance and counseling, and vocational education personnel training. Information was gathered through a survey of state research coordinating unit (RCU) directors, in all states, with 100 percent participation. The study indicated that the 10 percent handicapped and 20 percent disadvantaged set-aside funds were not generally used by most states to fund program improvement programs and activities. This does not necessarily suggest that the states have not funded program improvement activities that had an impact upon special needs learners, nor that the set-asides have not been appropriately used as basic grants to support the excess costs of educating handicapped an disadvantaged students in vocational education. Future state funding policies should reflect increased collaboration among vocational education, special education, vocational rehabilitation, and other agencies. Program efforts should be made to meet the needs of the handicapped and disadvantaged populations with potentially less funds and funding sources. (The appendix contains brief abstracts of various program improvement projects funded by the states.) (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED208227

Use of State Special Needs Set-Aside Funds for Program Improvement Activities

Policy Research and Resource Series: Document 8

James P. Greenan
Research and Development Coordinator
Leadership Training Institute/
Vocational and Special Education
University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign

A Publication of the
**LEADERSHIP TRAINING INSTITUTE/
VOCATIONAL AND SPECIAL EDUCATION**

College of Education
University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign

Sponsored by

Division of Personnel Preparation
Office of Special Education
U.S. Education Department

CE 030 345

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2 ✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Janet Treichel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

October 1981

The contents of this publication were developed under grant number G007900952 from the Division of Personnel Preparation, Office of Special Education, U.S. Education Department. However, these contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the agency, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.

Foreword

Provisions for the evaluation and improvement of programs have historically been an integral component of federal and state educational legislation. Both Public Law 94-142 (The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975) and Public Law 94-482 (The Education Amendments of 1976 - Title II: Vocational Education) contain numerous provisions for personnel development, support for programs, and research and development activities. These provisions serve to stimulate and regenerate the development; dissemination; and adoption of new ideas, techniques, and materials for the fields of special education and vocational education.

The study presented herein was designed to examine the extent to which program improvement funds from Public Law 94-482 were used by states to also address another priority for state vocational education programs serving handicapped and disadvantaged students. More specifically, Subpart 3 of Public Law 94-482 allows states to use funds for research, exemplary and innovative programs, curriculum development, vocational guidance and counseling, and vocational education personnel training. Grants for these programs are described in the legislation as "program improvement and supportive services." Twenty percent (20%) of the federal funds received by a state for vocational education is to be spent for these purposes. Simultaneously, ten percent (10%) and twenty percent (20%) of the funds are to be spent for the excess costs of providing vocational education to handicapped and disadvantaged students respectively. Under the law, the 10% and 20% set-aside funds can be used for either direct programs and services or program improvement and supportive services.

State and local administrators of vocational and special education programs should find this study useful in describing how the set-aside funds have been spent for special population groups in vocational education over the last three years. The Appendix includes brief abstracts of the various program improvement projects funded by the states. The LTI project is indebted to Dr. James P. Greenan for managing and conducting this study. Appreciation is also extended to R. Brian Cobb and Ms. Laurie Batchelor for their efforts in developing and editing the abstracts. Dr. George Hagerty of the U.S. Office of Special Education was helpful in planning the study. The comments made by the reviewers were extremely helpful in preparing the final report: Dr. Wesley Budke, Director, National Center for Research in Vocational Education Clearinghouse, The Ohio State University; Dr. Rupert N. Evans, Bureau of Educational Research, University of Illinois; Dr. John S. Washburn, Manager, Research and Development, Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education, Illinois State Board of Education; Dr. Ronald McCage, Director, Vocational and Technical Education Consortium of States, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools; Dr. William Eddy, Equal Opportunity Specialist, Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education; Dr. Addison S. Hobbs, State Director, Division of Vocational-Technical Education, Maryland State Department of Education; and Ms. Barbara H. Kemp, Education Program Specialist for the Disadvantaged, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education. The LTI staff is also extremely grateful to the State Research Coordinating Unit Directors for their cooperation and assistance in the data collection phase

of the study. In addition, the staff would also like to thank Ms. Nancy Schum for her effort in typing and Ms. Barbara Macikas for proofreading the report. Dr. Janet Treichel was instrumental in the production and dissemination of this report.

L. Allen Phelps, Director
Leadership Training Institute/
Vocational and Special Education

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION 1

Statement of the Problem 4

Objectives of the Study. 5

Research Questions. 6

Significance of the Study 7

RESEARCH PROCEDURES 9

Instrumentation 9

Population. 9

Data Collection 10

Data Analysis 10

FINDINGS. 13

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 35

Summary 35

Conclusions 38

Recommendations 40

REFERENCES 47

APPENDIX 49

Introduction

Several recent significant pieces of federal legislation have established the rights of special needs learners to a free and appropriate public education (Public Law 93-112, The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 Sections 503 and 504; Public Law 93-203, The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973; Public Law 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975). These initiatives have increased educational and employment opportunities for all special populations. At the national, state, and local levels more emphasis has been placed on expanding the availability of vocational education instruction and support services to handicapped and disadvantaged (including limited-English proficiency) learners.

A major thrust in vocational education has been to provide special needs learners with individualized education programs (IEP) within least restrictive environments (LRE) as mandated by Public Law 94-142. Public Law 94-482 (The Education Amendments of 1976 - Title II: Vocational Education) which amends Public Law 88-210 (The Vocational Education Act of 1963) and Public Law 90-576 (The Vocational Education Amendments of 1968) has reinforced these activities by proclaiming that states should use vocational education funds to assist handicapped individuals so that they can participate in regular vocational education programs to the "maximum extent possible."

To achieve this end, handicapped and disadvantaged students should be "mainstreamed" into vocational programs where they are educated with their "normal" peers. Extra support and supplemental services are needed by both students and teachers in programs to accomplish this

goal. Supplemental services may include: assignment of special education personnel to the class, special program modifications, special remedial instruction, counseling, and other services provided to handicapped or disadvantaged students in regular vocational programs. However, providing instructional arrangements and services such as IEPs and LREs for special needs students generally costs more than traditional education programming.

Public Law 94-482 has provided set-aside funds specifically for the vocational education of special needs learners. The law has mandated that:

> For each fiscal year, at least 10% of each state's allotment under Section 103 shall be used to pay 50% of the cost of vocational education for handicapped persons. For each fiscal year, at least 20% of each state's allotment under Section 103 shall be used to pay 50% of the cost of vocational education for disadvantaged persons (other than handicapped persons), for persons who have limited-English speaking ability, and for providing stipends authorized under section 120(b) (1) (G) (Section 110).

These funds are to be used primarily for basic grants (Subpart 2) which are flow-through funds to local education agencies to support the excess costs of educating special needs learners in regular vocational programs. The funds may also be used to support research and development activities designed to impact vocational programs for handicapped and disadvantaged students.

Subpart 3 (Program Improvement and Support Services) of Public Law 94-482, Part A, lists, defines, and describes the areas in which set-aside funds may be used for improving vocational programming of handicapped and disadvantaged learners. Areas of funding under program improvement and support services may include: research, exemplary and innovative programs, curriculum development, vocational guidance and counseling, and vocational education personnel training.

Generally, the state education agencies have flexibility in the ways they distribute the set-aside funds for program improvement and support services purposes. Local education agencies, individuals, institutions of higher education, and research and development firms are among the eligible recipients of these funds. Proposals are commonly funded based on the perceived areas of need within the states. The needs may be identified by informal procedures or by formal methods such as statewide needs assessments and evaluations. Therefore, it is expected that there will be variation among the states in the types and amounts of funded proposals.

A few investigations have attempted to identify or assess policy regarding the funding of program improvement and support services activities in vocational education. Budke and Magisos (1978) identified the research, exemplary and innovative programs, and curriculum development projects that have been funded by the states with Subpart 3 funds. However, vocational guidance and counseling and vocational education personnel training projects were not identified. In addition, most states have not reported (i.e., do not report projects to dissemination networks such as the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, but are reported in the states' accountability reports) those program improvement projects which are funded in whole or in part using the handicapped and disadvantaged set-aside funds.

The Abt Study (1981) investigated the pattern of expenditures and service delivery issues with respect to the use of the handicapped and disadvantaged set-aside funds. The general conclusions were that the set-aside funds were "clearly meeting the congressional intent" of providing vocational education funds to these populations. However, the Abt

Study dealt with a sample of only 15 states and the findings did not relate to specific criteria or a framework, such as statewide or national needs assessments or evaluations for determining the appropriateness and effectiveness of the projects. Several needs assessments and policy issue and problem studies focusing on the needs of special needs learners have suggested the importance of program improvement activities to deal with problems such as interagency cooperation and agreements, personnel preparation and development, funding and fiscal policy, service delivery and program alternatives, and program evaluation and improvement. Specific areas of concern have included: vocational assessment; individualized education programs; least restrictive environment; identification of students; and facilities, materials, and equipment modification (Davis and Ward, 1978; Howard, 1979; Phelps and Thornton, 1979; Greenan and Phelps, 1980).

In summary, the research literature contains few studies that are concerned with how states are using their handicapped and disadvantaged set-aside funds provided by Public Law 94-482 to improve and expand vocational education opportunities for special needs learners. Further, in those studies that do exist, minimal information is provided which relates what is being funded to assessed needs. However, as funds become more scarce and fiscal efficiency becomes more important, the states will need to develop improved funding policies and increasingly coordinate program improvement planning, assessment, and activities.

Statement of the Problem

The central problem investigated in this study was to determine the extent to which the 50 states, District of Columbia, and trust territories

(American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and Virgin Islands) have used their Public Law 94-482 set-aside funds (10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged) to support program improvement projects and activities. The specific research problem was to identify the research, exemplary and innovative programs, curriculum development, vocational guidance and counseling, and vocational education personnel training projects that have been funded during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981. In addition, the extent to which federal set-aside funds and matching state and local funds were used to support program improvement activities was investigated.

It was not the intent of this study to identify all state programs and activities which impacted upon special needs learners. For example, Subpart 3 funds which may have been used to support projects that impacted upon handicapped and disadvantaged students but were not counted as set-asides were not examined. Only those projects and activities that were specifically funded with the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds were investigated. In addition, this study did not attempt to assess the effectiveness of the projects nor determine the levels or focus of funding of basic grants to LEAs.

Objectives of the Study

The following objectives were developed to resolve the central problem of this study:

1. Determine the extent to which research, exemplary and innovative programs, curriculum development, vocational guidance and counseling, and vocational education personnel training projects were funded by the states using the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981.

II. Assess the federal set-aside and matching state and local funding levels of the projects.

III. Determine the scope of the program improvement and support services projects.

IV. Identify several program improvement projects and develop abstracts.

Research Questions

The following research questions were developed to achieve the objectives of this study:

1. How many RESEARCH projects were funded by the states using the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds; and what were the local, state, and federal funding levels of the projects during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981?

2. How many EXEMPLARY AND INNOVATIVE PROGRAM projects were funded by the states using the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds; and what were the local, state, and federal funding levels of the projects during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981?

3. How many CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT projects were funded by the states using the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds; and what were the local, state, and federal funding levels of the projects during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981?

4. How many VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING projects were funded by the states using the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds; and what were the local, state, and federal funding levels of the projects during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981?

5. How many VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL TRAINING projects were funded by the states using the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds; and what were the local, state, and federal funding levels of the projects during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981?

6. What content, program, or problem areas were addressed by the program improvement and support services projects funded by the states using the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981?

Significance of the Study

Program improvement projects and activities are essential for improving and expanding vocational education opportunities for special needs learners. These activities assist in generating new knowledge, developing new programs and curriculum for enhancing the career development of handicapped and disadvantaged students, and training personnel to work with special needs students. As special needs students are increasingly placed in regular vocational programs, the need for appropriate and effective program improvement activities will become even more significant.

This study contributes to the body of knowledge in vocational education funding policy by providing data and information which identify the program improvement projects states have funded using the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-asides in the areas of research, exemplary and innovative programs, curriculum development, vocational guidance and counseling, and vocational education personnel training. Analysis of the activities and funding levels of the projects supported during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981 provides an indication of the patterns of funding and the extent to which specific areas of need are or are not being addressed within the states and across the nation.

The data and information should be helpful to policy and decision-makers including: state directors of vocational and special education, state consultants for vocational special needs education (handicapped and disadvantaged), state directors of compensatory education, state directors of bilingual education, research coordinating unit directors and their staffs, teacher educators, local education agency personnel, individuals from public and private research firms, and others who are generators and consumers of program improvement projects and activities. The

information could be useful for activities such as planning needs assessments, developing RFPs, or evaluating existing program improvement projects.

Research Procedures

This study used several research procedures to achieve the major objectives and answer the research questions. The procedures included: the development of a survey instrument, selection of a population, collection of data, and analysis of the data. The research procedures occurred over a five-month period.

Instrumentation

A six-page survey instrument was developed to collect the necessary data in this study (see Appendix A). The cover page asked the Research Coordinating Unit (RCU) directors to provide their names, addresses, and telephone numbers. The instrument also provided the respondents with step-by-step instructions, including an example, for completing the survey. Five different survey forms were contained in the instrument and included the program improvement areas of research, exemplary and innovative programs, curriculum development, vocational guidance and counseling, and vocational education personnel training. The directors were asked to list on each of the survey forms project titles for fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981, and the federal set-aside and matching state and local funding levels of each project.

Population

The population for this study consisted of the RCU directors from the 50 states, District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands.

Data Collection

The RCU directors' names and addresses were drawn from the current national RCU directory. The surveys and cover letters (see Appendix B) were mailed in mid-October 1980, and were to be returned by mid-November 1980. The RCU directors were also requested to include abstracts for each project listed on the survey forms. The initial response rate was 58%. A follow-up letter (see Appendix C) and another survey was mailed to each non-respondent during the third week of November 1980 and was to be returned by the third week of December 1980. The follow-up increased the response rate to 82%. During the second week of January 1981, a telephone follow-up was conducted requesting each non-respondent to return his survey. The data collection process was concluded during mid-March 1981. The final response rate was 100%. The data collection process occurred over a four-month period.

Data Analysis

The data obtained from each of the surveys were collectively analyzed across the states and territories. Descriptive data tables were generated for each of the research questions. The tables specifically provide information with respect to the numbers of projects; federal set-aside and matching state and local funding levels; and the scope of the program improvement projects that were funded during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981. The tables generally provide an overall view of the kinds of projects that states have funded using the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds. In addition, a representative sample of abstracts were selected and edited from those provided by the

RCU directors. The abstracts provide information regarding some of the content, program, or problem areas addressed by the projects. The abstracts were not selected using specific evaluative criteria. Rather, the abstracts were selected and included based on an overall breadth of topical areas.

Findings

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which the states have used Public Law 94-482 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds to support program improvement projects and activities. Fifty-seven states and territories were surveyed. The data that were collected focused specifically on the major objectives and research questions developed in this study. Therefore, the following discussion of the findings and Tables 1-11 are concerned with the major objectives and research questions of this study.

Objective I: Determine the extent to which research, exemplary and innovative programs, curriculum development, vocational guidance and counseling, and vocational education personnel training projects were funded by the states using the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981.

Objective II: Assess the federal set-aside and matching state and local funding levels of the projects.

1. How many RESEARCH projects were funded by the states using the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds; and what were the local, state, and federal funding levels of the projects during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981?

The research projects funded by the states using the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981 are presented in Table 1. Twenty-five of the 57 states and territories funded at least one research project with the set-asides during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981. Seven states did not provide data on the number of projects they funded. However, from the data available, a total of 92 research projects were funded during the three-year period. Twenty-four projects were funded during each of fiscal years 1979 and 1981 while a substantially larger number (44) of projects

TABLE 1
RESEARCH PROJECTS THAT WERE FUNDED BY THE STATES USING THE SET-ASIDE FUNDS DURING FISCAL YEARS 1979, 1980, AND 1981

State	FY 1979	FY 1980	FY 1981	Total
Alaska	1	0	0	1
Arkansas	2	3	2	7
California	—	0	0	—
Colorado	1	0	0	1
Florida	1	5	0	6
Idaho	1	1	0	2
Illinois	3	6	2	11
Indiana	2	15	4	21
Iowa	—	—	—	—
Kansas	1	0	1	2
Kentucky	1	2	4	7
Maine	—	—	—	—
Maryland	2	0	0	2
Massachusetts	—	—	—	—
Minnesota	2	1	3	6
New Jersey	1	3	4	8
New York	3	2	0	5
North Dakota	0	2	1	3
Ohio	0	1	1	2
Oregon	—	—	—	—
Pennsylvania	—	—	—	—
Rhode Island	1	0	0	1
South Carolina	0	0	2	2
Texas	2	3	0	5
Virginia	—	—	—	—
All States	24	44	24	92

N = 57
n = 25 (states that funded at least one (1) project during the three-year period)
— = data not available

20

were funded in fiscal year 1980. This increase was probably caused by the larger number of projects funded by Indiana (15) during fiscal year 1980. Indiana reported the greatest number of projects funded (21) during the three-year period. However, while Indiana funded a larger number of projects with the set-asides than the other states, all of their projects were reportedly jointly funded with non-special needs monies (i.e., Subpart 3 funds not counted as set-asides and other funding sources). Indiana's set-aside funds are generally infused with programs and activities that are designed for all students. This type of funding policy is probably practiced in several other states. Illinois, New Jersey, Arkansas, and Kentucky also funded several research projects using the set-asides. These five states supported 59% of all the funded projects.

Table 2 illustrates the federal set-aside and matching state and local funding levels of the research projects funded during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981. A total of $4,609,825 of combined federal set-aside and matching state and local funds was used to support research projects during the three-year period by the 23 states reporting data. For each fiscal year, the federal set-aside represented the largest funding source and the state funds the smallest funding source. Several states funded research projects with only the federal set-asides.

In summary, most states have not used their federal handicapped and disadvantaged set-aside funds and matching state and local funds to support research projects and activities relative to the vocational education of special needs learners. However, of the 25 states that have funded projects, the federal set-asides generally represented the largest portion of funding.

TABLE 2

FEDERAL SET-ASIDE AND MATCHING STATE AND LOCAL FUNDING LEVELS OF THE RESEARCH PROJECTS THAT WERE FUNDED DURING FISCAL YEARS 1979, 1980 AND 1981

State	FY 1979				FY 1980				FY1981				Total
	Local	State	Federal	Total	Local	State	Federal	Total	Local	State	Federal	Total	
Alaska	0	0	$6,650	$6,650	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	$6,650
Arkansas	$6,818	0	$28,025	$34,843	$665	0	$37,068	$37,733	0	0	$71,813	$71,813	$144,389
California	–	–	$620,290	$620,290	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	$620,290
Colorado	0	0	$49,967	$49,967	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	$49,967
Florida	0	0	$20,000	$20,000	0	0	$170,270	$170,270	0	0	0	0	$190,270
Idaho	0	0	$1,015	$1,015	0	0	$6,443	$6,443	0	0	0	0	$7,458
Illinois	$17,627	0	$204,370	$221,997	$20,328	0	$323,221	$343,549	0	0	$235,840	$235,840	$801,386
Indiana	0	0	$6,540	$6,540	0	0	$109,613	$109,613	0	0	$66,720	$66,720	$182,873
Iowa	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Kansas	$7,500	0	$7,500	$15,000	0	0	0	0	$14,483	0	$16,204	$30,687	$45,687
Kentucky	$10,842	0	$21,278	$32,120	$5,287	0	$21,554	$26,841	$72,045	0	$86,627	$158,672	$217,633
Maine	0	0	$1,000	$1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	$1,000
Maryland	0	0	$43,430	$43,430	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	$43,430
Massachusetts	$83,866	0	$300,000	$383,866	0	0	$300,000	$300,000	0	0	$400,000	$400,000	$1,083,866
Minnesota	0	$20,872	$22,387	$43,259	0	$10,146	$21,383	$31,529	0	0	$12,976	$12,976	$87,764
New York	0	$6,458	$316,427	$322,885	0	$6,500	$93,500	$100,000	0	0	0	0	$422,885
New Jersey	0	0	$17,080	$17,080	0	0	$71,604	$71,604	0	0	$111,130	$111,130	$199,814
North Dakota	0	0	0	0	0	0	$3,950	$3,950	0	0	$10,241	$10,241	$14,191
Ohio	0	0	0	0	0	0	$35,000	$35,000	0	0	$35,000	$35,000	$70,000
Oregon	0	0	0	0	0	0	$71,294	$71,294	0	0	0	0	$71,294
Pennsylvania	0	$11,602	$106,268	$117,870	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	$117,870
Rhode Island	0	0	$10,517	$10,517	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	$10,517
South Carolina	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	$8,734	$8,734	$8,734
Texas	0	0	$80,141	$80,141	0	0	$131,716	$131,716	0	0	0	0	$211,857
Virginia	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
All States	$126,653	$38,932	$1,862,885	$2,028,470	$26,280	$6,500	$1,342,616	$1,439,542	$86,528	–	$1,291,125	$1,141,768	$4,609,825

N = 57

n = 25 (states that funded at least one (1) project during the three-year period)

– = data not available

2. How many EXEMPLARY AND INNOVATIVE PROGRAM projects were funded by the states using the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds; and what were the local, state, and federal funding levels of the projects during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981?

The exemplary and innovative program projects funded by the states using the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981 are presented in Table 3. Twenty-two of the 57 states funded at least one exemplary and innovative program project with the set-asides during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981. Six states did not provide data on the number of projects they funded. However, from the data available, it appears that a total of 106 exemplary and innovative program projects were funded during the three-year period. Fifty-two projects were funded during fiscal year 1979, while considerably fewer projects were funded for each of fiscal years 1980 and 1981. Texas reported the largest number of projects funded (27) during the three-year period. Illinois, New Jersey, and Alaska also funded a relatively large number of exemplary and innovative program projects. These four states funded 63% of all the projects.

Table 4 illustrates the federal set-aside and matching state and local funding levels of the exemplary and innovative program projects funded during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981. A total of $5,932,805 of combined federal set-aside and matching state and local funds was used to support exemplary and innovative program projects during the three-year period by the 18 states reporting data. For each fiscal year, the federal set-aside was the largest funding source and the state funds the smallest funding source. Most states used only federal set-aside monies to fund exemplary and innovative program projects for the handicapped and disadvantaged.

TABLE 3
EXEMPLARY AND INNOVATIVE PROGRAM PROJECTS THAT WERE FUNDED BY THE STATES USING THE SET-ASIDE FUNDS DURING FISCAL YEARS 1979, 1980, AND 1981

State	FY 1979	FY 1980	FY 1981	Total
Alaska	1	3	6	10
Arizona	0	3	0	3
Florida	2	1	3	6
Idaho	1	0	0	1
Illinois	10	4	4	18
Indiana	4	0	0	4
Iowa	—	—	—	—
Kansas	4	2	0	6
Maine	—	—	—	—
Maryland	4	1	0	5
Massachusetts	—	—	—	—
Michigan	1	0	0	1
Minnesota	1	0	0	1
New Jersey	2	3	7	12
New Mexico	0	1	1	2
North Dakota	1	0	0	1
Ohio	—	—	—	—
Oregon	—	—	—	—
Rhode Island	8	0	0	8
South Dakota	1	0	0	1
Texas	12	15	0	27
Virginia	—	—	—	—
All States	52	33	21	106

N = 57
n = 22 (states that funded at least one (1) project during the three-year period)
— = data not available

TABLE 4

FEDERAL SET-ASIDE AND MATCHING STATE AND LOCAL FUNDING LEVELS OF THE EXEMPLARY AND INNOVATIVE PROGRAM PROJECTS THAT WERE FUNDED DURING FISCAL YEARS 1979, 1980, AND 1981

State	FY 1979				FY 1980				FY1981				
	Local	State	Federal	Total	Local	State	Federal	Total	Local	State	Federal	Total	Total
Alaska	0	0	$6,508	$6,508	0	0	$33,606	$33,606	0	0	$162,500	$162,500	$202,614
Arizona	0	0	0	0	0	0	$164,690	$164,690	0	0	0	0	$164,690
Florida	0	0	$80,000	$80,000	0	0	$10,000	$10,000	0	0	$78,853	$78,853	$168,853
Idaho	0	0	$10,000	$10,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	$10,000
Illinois	$484,055	0	$625,450	$1,109,505	$196,332	0	$305,827	$502,159	$52,136	0	$243,099	$295,235	$1,906,899
Indiana	0	0	$100,000	$100,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	$100,000
Iowa	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kansas	$65,385	0	$69,327	$134,712	$35,163	0	$38,117	$73,280	0	0	0	0	$207,992
Maine	0	0	$48,375	$48,375	0	0	$48,037	$48,037	0	0	$54,000	$54,000	$150,412
Maryland	0	0	$74,050	$74,050	0	0	$15,000	$15,000	0	0	0	0	$89,050
Massachusetts	—	0	$300,000	$300,000	0	0	$457,339	$457,339	0	0	$830,594	$830,594	$1,587,933
Michigan	0	0	$30,693	$30,693	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	$30,693
Minnesota	0	0	$24,864	$24,864	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	$24,864
New Jersey	0	0	$59,575	$59,575	0	0	$77,229	$77,229	0	0	$153,983	$153,983	$290,787
New Mexico	0	0	0	0	0	0	$25,000	$25,000	0	0	$25,000	$25,000	$50,000
North Dakota	0	$5,452	$6,000	$11,452	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	$11,452
Ohio	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Oregon	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rhode Island	0	0	$17,934	$17,934	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	$17,934
South Dakota	0	$27,250	$27,250	$54,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	$54,500
Texas	0	0	$357,329	$357,329	0	0	$506,803	$506,803	0	0	0	0	$864,132
Virginia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
All States	$549,440	$32,702	$1,837,355	$2,419,497	$231,495	—	$1,681,648	$1,913,143	$52,136	—	$1,548,029	$1,600,165	$5,932,805

N = 57

n = 22 (states that funded at least one (1) project during the three-year period)

— = data not available

In summary, most states have not used their federal handicapped and disadvantaged set-aside funds and matching state and local funds to support exemplary and innovative program projects and activities. However, of the 22 states which have funded projects, the federal set-aside generally was the greatest portion of funding.

3. How many CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT projects were funded by the states using the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds; and what were the local, state, and federal funding levels of the projects during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981?

The curriculum development projects funded by the states using the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981 are presented in Table 5. Twenty-one of the 57 states funded at least one curriculum development project with the set-asides during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981. Six states did not provide data on the number of projects they funded. However, from the data available, a total of 100 curriculum development projects were funded during the three-year period. Fifty-four projects were funded during fiscal year 1980, 31 during 1979, and 15 during 1981. Arizona reported the largest number of projects funded (30) during the three-year period. However, all 30 projects were actually funded in fiscal year 1980. Indiana, New Jersey, New York, Alaska, and Texas also funded several curriculum development projects. These six states funded 76% of all the projects.

Table 6 illustrates the federal set-aside and matching state and local funding levels of the curriculum development projects funded during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981. A total of $4,672,204 of combined federal set-aside and state and local matching funds was used to support curricu-

TABLE 5
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS THAT WERE FUNDED BY THE STATES USING THE SET-ASIDE FUNDS DURING FISCAL YEARS 1979, 1980, AND 1981

State	FY 1979	FY 1980	FY 1981	Total
Alaska	3	2	3	8
Arizona	0	30	0	30
California	—	0	0	—
Florida	0	1	2	3
Illinois	1	1	1	3
Indiana	10	3	1	14
Iowa	—	—	—	—
Kansas	0	1	0	1
Maine	—	—	—	—
Maryland	5	0	0	5
Massachusetts	—	—	—	—
Michigan	1	0	2	3
Minnesota	1	2	0	3
New Jersey	3	3	3	9
New Mexico	0	0	2	2
New York	4	4	0	8
Ohio	0	1	1	2
Oregon	—	—	—	—
South Dakota	0	2	0	2
Texas	3	4	0	7
Virginia	—	—	—	—
All States	31	54	15	100

N = 57
n = 21 (states that funded at least one (1) project during the three-year period)
— = data not available

TABLE 6

FEDERAL SET-ASIDE AND MATCHING STATE AND LOCAL FUNDING LEVELS OF THE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS THAT WERE FUNDED DURING FISCAL YEARS 1979, 1980, AND 1981

State	FY 1979				FY 1980				FY1981				
	Local	State	Federal	Total	Local	State	Federal	Total	Local	State	Federal	Total	Total
Alaska	0	0	$23,611	$23,611	0	0	$30,000	$30,000	0	0	0	$60,981	$114,592
Arizona	0	0	0	0	0	0	$830,205	$830,205	0	0	0	0	$830,205
California	–	–	$187,619	$187,619	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	$187,619
Florida	0	0	0	0	0	0	$25,875	$25,875	0	0	$51,660	$51,660	$77,535
Illinois	$12,888	0	$35,560	$48,448	$18,606	0	$29,931	$48,537	$44,399	0	$90,000	$134,399	$231,384
Indiana	0	0	$194,955	$194,955	0	0	$27,900	$27,900	0	0	$14,100	$14,100	$236,955
Iowa	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Kansas	0	0	0	0	$311	0	$311	$622	0	0	0	0	$622
Maine	0	0	$114,000	$114,000	0	0	$71,000	$71,000	0	0	$49,000	$49,000	$234,000
Maryland	0	0	$70,500	$70,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	$70,500
Massachusetts	$18,539	–	$200,000	$218,539	0	0	$250,000	$250,000	0	0	$200,000	$200,000	$668,539
Michigan	0	0	$90,663	$90,663	0	0	0	0	0	0	$135,000	$135,000	$225,663
Minnesota	0	0	$16,500	$16,500	0	0	$3,594	$3,594	0	0	0	0	$20,094
New Jersey	0	0	$35,884	$35,884	0	0	$30,126	$30,126	0	0	$47,525	$47,525	$113,535
New Mexico	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	$172,000	$172,000	$172,000
New York	0	$14,376	$315,478	$329,854	0	$19,562	$267,673	$287,235	0	0	0	0	$617,089
Ohio	0	0	0	0	0	0	$14,000	$14,000	0	0	$20,000	$20,000	$34,000
Oregon	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
South Dakota	0	0	0	0	0	0	$41,200	$41,200	0	0	0	0	$41,200
Texas	0	0	$408,691	$408,691	0	0	$387,981	$387,981	0	0	0	0	$796,672
Virginia	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
All States	$31,427	$14,379	$1,693,461	$1,676,664	$18,917	$19,562	$2,009,796	$2,048,275	$44,399	–	$779,285	$884,665	$4,672,204

N = 57

n = 21 (states that funded at least one (1) project during the three-year period)

– = data not available

lum development projects during the three-year period by the 18 states reporting data. For each fiscal year, the federal set-aside was the largest funding source and for the most part state funds the smallest funding source. Most states funded curriculum development projects solely with federal funds.

In summary, most states have not used their federal handicapped and disadvantaged set-aside funds and matching state and local funds to support curriculum development projects and activities. However, for the majority of the 21 states which have funded such projects, the federal set-aside provided all or the greatest portion of funding.

4. How many VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING projects were funded by the states using the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds; and what were the local, state, and federal funding levels of the projects during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981?

The vocational guidance and counseling projects funded by the states using the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981 are presented in Table 7. Nineteen of the 57 states funded at least one vocational guidance and counseling project with the set-asides during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981. Seven states did not provide data on the number of projects they funded. However, from the data available, a total of 116 vocational guidance and counseling projects were funded during the three-year period. Fifty projects were funded during fiscal year 1980, 42 during 1981, and 24 during 1979. Kansas reported the largest number of projects funded (34), nearly one-third of all projects during the three-year period. Florida and Indiana also funded a relatively large number of vocational guidance and counseling projects (22). The projects that were funded by

TABLE 7
VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING PROJECTS THAT WERE FUNDED BY THE STATES USING THE SET-ASIDE FUNDS DURING FISCAL YEARS 1979, 1980, AND 1981

State	FY 1979	FY 1980	FY 1981	Total
Alaska	1	2	1	4
Arizona	0	5	0	5
California	—	0	0	—
Florida	9	5	8	22
Indiana	1	11	10	22
Iowa	—	—	—	—
Kansas	6	10	18	34
Maryland	3	0	0	3
Massachusetts	—	—	—	—
Michigan	1	0	1	2
Minnesota	2	3	3	8
Missouri	—	—	—	—
New Jersey	0	0	1	1
New York	1	2	0	3
Oregon	—	9	0	9
Texas	0	3	0	3
Virginia	—	—	—	—
Wisconsin	—	—	0	—
Puerto Rico	—	—	—	—
All States	24	50	42	116

N = 57
n = 19 (states that funded at least one (1) project during the three-year period)
— = data not available

Kansas, Florida, and Indiana represented 67% of all the projects that were funded by the states during the three-year period.

Table 8 illustrates the federal set-aside and matching state and local funding levels of the vocational guidance and counseling projects funded during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981. A total of $5,948,185 of combined federal set-aside and matching state and local funds was used to support vocational guidance and counseling projects and activities during the three-year period by the 14 states reporting data. For each fiscal year, the federal set-aside was the largest funding source. However, vocational guidance and counseling projects were funded very minimally by matching state funds but local funds were relatively large in some states. This may suggest that the state education agencies in these states feel vocational guidance and counseling is primarily a local education agency's responsibility. Another plausible explanation is that local staff such as guidance counselors are already in the schools and can facilitate the conduct of projects. Most of the states funded projects with only federal set-asides.

In summary, most states have not used their federal set-aside funds and matching state and local funds to support vocational guidance and counseling projects and activities. However, of the 19 states which have funded projects, the federal set-aside generally was the greatest portion of funding while the matching state funds represented only a very minimal portion of funding, and local funds represented a relatively large contribution for some states.

5. How many VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL TRAINING projects were funded by the states using the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds; and what were the local, state, and federal funding levels of the projects during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981?

TABLE 8

FEDERAL SET-ASIDE AND MATCHING STATE AND LOCAL FUNDING LEVELS OF THE VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING PROJECTS THAT WERE FUNDED DURING FISCAL YEARS 1979, 1980, AND 1981

State	FY 1979				FY 1980				FY1981				Total
	Local	State	Federal	Total	Local	State	Federal	Total	Local	State	Federal	Total	
Alaska	0	0	$20,371	$20,371	0	0	$5,023	$5,023	0	0	$10,000	$10,000	$35,394
Arizona	0	0	0	0	0	0	$196,396	$196,396	0	0	0	0	$196,396
California	–	–	$988,371	$988,371	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	$988,371
Florida	0	0	$110,536	$110,536	0	0	$75,605	$75,605	0	0	$55,250	$55,250	$241,391
Indiana	0	0	$6,000	$6,000	0	0	$269,759	$269,759	0	0	$43,203	$43,203	$318,962
Iowa	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Kansas	$120,911	0	$130,942	$251,853	$183,612	0	$156,825	$340,437	$373,985	0	$380,222	$754,207	$1,346,497
Maryland	$211,789	0	$211,789	$423,578	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	$423,578
Massachusetts	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Michigan	0	0	$74,649	$74,649	0	0	0	0	0	0	$50,000	$50,000	$124,649
Minnesota	0	0	$31,890	$31,890	0	0	$40,159	$40,159	0	0	$42,378	$42,378	$114,427
Missouri	0	0	$378,000	$378,000	0	0	$255,000	$255,000	0	0	$350,000	$350,000	$983,000
New Jersey	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	$11,072	$11,072	$11,072
New York	0	$4,760	$233,240	$238,000	0	$12,518	$613,371	$625,889	0	0	0	0	$863,889
Oregon	0	0	0	0	0	0	$170,756	$170,756	0	0	0	0	$170,756
Texas	0	0	0	0	0	0	$94,409	$94,409	0	0	0	0	$94,409
Virginia	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Wisconsin	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	0	0	0	0	–
Puerto Rico	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
All States	$332,700	$4,760	$2,185,788	$2,523,248	$132,612	$12,518	$1,877,303	$2,073,433	$373,985	–	$942,125	$1,316,110	$5,948,185

N = 57

n = 19 (states that funded at least one (1) project during the three-year period)

– = data not available

The vocational education personnel training projects funded by the states using the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds during fiscal years, 1979, 1980, and 1981 are presented in Table 9. Twenty-seven of the 57 states funded at least one vocational education personnel training project with the set-asides during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981. Five states did not provide data on the number of projects they funded. However, the available data indicate a total of 158 vocational education personnel training projects were funded over the three-year period. Seventy-five projects were funded during fiscal year 1980, 43 during 1979, and 40 during 1981. New Hampshire reported the largest number of projects funded (20) during the three-year period. Florida, Minnesota, Maryland, Texas, and New Jersey also funded a relatively large number of vocational education personnel training projects. Sixty percent of all the projects funded were from these states.

Table 10 illustrates the federal set-aside and matching state and local funding levels of the vocational education personnel training projects funded during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981. A total of $5,662,734 of combined federal set-aside and matching state and local funds was used to support vocational education personnel training projects and activities during the three-year period by the 24 states reporting data. For each fiscal year, the federal set-aside was the largest funding source and the state funds the smallest funding source. Most states funded vocational education personnel training projects with only federal set-asides.

In summary, most states have not used their federal set-aside funds and matching state and local funds to support vocational education personnel training projects and activities. However, of the 27 states which

TABLE 9
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL TRAINING PROJECTS THAT WERE FUNDED BY THE STATES USING THE SET-ASIDE FUNDS DURING FISCAL YEARS 1979, 1980, AND 1981

State	FY 1979	FY 1980	FY 1981	Total
Alaska	1	0	2	3
Arizona	0	6	0	6
Arkansas	1	1	0	2
California	—	0	0	—
Connecticut	0	0	1	1
Florida	8	10	1	19
Idaho	1	2	0	3
Illinois	1	3	2	6
Indiana	2	2	1	5
Iowa	—	—	—	—
Kansas	2	1	3	6
Maryland	7	5	2	14
Massachusetts	1	3	2	6
Michigan	2	1	2	5
Minnesota	4	10	5	19
Missouri	0	—	0	—
Nebraska	0	1	0	1
New Hampshire	5	9	6	20
New Jersey	2	5	4	11
New Mexico	0	1	2	3
New York	1	1	0	2
North Dakota	0	2	2	4
Oregon	—	—	—	—
South Carolina	0	1	1	2
South Dakota	0	4	4	8
Texas	5	7	0	12
Virginia	—	—	—	—
All States	43	75	40	158

N = 57
n = 27 (states that funded at least one (1) project during the three-year period)
— = data not available

TABLE 10

FEDERAL SET-ASIDE AND MATCHING STATE AND LOCAL FUNDING LEVELS OF THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL TRAINING PROJECTS THAT WERE FUNDED DURING FISCAL YEARS 1979, 1980, AND 1981

State	FY 1979				FY 1980				FY1981				
	Local	State	Federal	Total	Local	State	Federal	Total	Local	State	Federal	Total	Total
Alaska	0	0	$6,500	$6,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	$36,500	$36,500	$43,000
Arizona	0	0	0	0	0	0	$345,194	$345,194	0	0	0	0	$345,194
Arkansas	$10,000	0	$40,900	$50,900	$3,100	0	$26,067	$29,167	0	0	0	0	$80,067
California	–	–	$1,033,532	$1,033,532	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	$1,033,532
Connecticut	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	$20,434	$20,434	$20,434
Florida	0	0	$223,300	$223,300	0	0	$273,962	$273,962	0	0	$86,300	$86,300	$583,562
Idaho	0	0	$4,450	$4,450	0	0	$4,389	$4,389	0	0	0	0	$8,839
Illinois	0	0	$70,000	$70,000	$45,382	0	$102,131	$147,513	$48,384	0	$107,462	$155,846	$373,359
Indiana	0	0	$29,000	$29,000	0	0	$6,000	$6,000	0	0	$3,000	$3,000	$38,000
Iowa	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Kansas	$4,938	0	$7,492	$12,430	$801	0	$1,602	$2,403	$12,835	0	$21,290	$34,125	$48,958
Maryland	0	0	$167,500	$167,500	0	0	$210,949	$210,949	0	0	$110,000	$110,000	$488,449
Massachusetts	0	0	$85,000	$85,000	0	0	$208,000	$208,000	0	0	$196,000	$196,000	$489,000
Michigan	$27,948	0	$105,518	$133,466	0	0	$75,000	$75,000	0	0	$176,000	$176,000	$384,466
Minnesota	0	0	$10,800	$10,800	0	0	$83,858	$83,858	0	0	0	$4,030	$158,688
Missouri	0	0	0	0	0	0	$30,000	$30,000	0	0	0	0	$30,000
Nebraska	0	0	0	0	0	$4,821	$3,995	$8,816	0	0	0	0	$8,816
New Hampshire	0	0	$68,526	$68,526	0	0	$124,648	$124,648	0	$2,312	$98,759	$101,071	$294,245
New Jersey	0	0	$41,125	$41,125	0	0	$26,645	$26,645	0	0	$45,238	$45,238	$113,008
New Mexico	0	0	0	0	0	0	$40,016	$40,016	0	0	$34,000	$34,000	$74,016
New York	0	$858	$42,054	$42,912	0	$31	$1,539	$1,570	0	0	0	0	$44,482
North Dakota	0	0	0	0	0	$3,483	$12,607	$16,090	0	$14,271	$48,778	$63,049	$79,139
Oregon	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
South Carolina	0	0	0	0	0	0	$44,598	$44,598	0	0	$40,674	$40,674	$85,272
South Dakota	0	0	0	0	0	0	$46,774	$46,774	0	0	$34,324	$34,324	$81,098
Texas	0	0	$391,637	$391,637	0	0	$365,428	$365,428	0	0	0	0	$757,065
Virginia	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
All States	$42,886	$858	$2,327,334	$2,371,078	$49,283	$8,335	$2,033,402	$2,091,020	$61,219	$16,583	$1,058,759	$1,140,591	$5,662,734

N = 57

n = 27 (states that funded at least one (1) project during the three-year period)

– = data not available

have funded projects, the federal set-aside was generally the largest portion of funding.

Objective III: Determine the scope of the program improvement and support services projects.

6. What content, program, or problem areas were addressed by the program improvement and support services projects funded by the states using the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981?

The content, program, or problem areas which were addressed by the program improvement and support services projects and funded by the states using the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981 are presented in Table 11. A total of 572 program improvement and support services projects were funded with the set-asides by the 27 states which funded at least one project or activity during the three-year period. Vocational education personnel training projects (158) were most frequently funded. Research projects and activities (92) were least frequently funded. Forty-eight percent of all funded projects and activities were in the areas of personnel preparation, support services, instructional methods and materials, and career development and exploration.

Personnel preparation and staff development for vocational educators relative to the vocational education of handicapped and disadvantaged learners were the most frequent kinds of funded projects and activities (16%) across the five funding areas. Personnel preparation and staff development programs were generally funded under vocational education personnel training. These programs commonly involved general preservice and inservice training of vocational educators and support personnel with

TABLE 11

CONTENT, PROGRAM, OR PROBLEM AREAS THAT WERE ADDRESSED BY THE PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT AND SUPPORT SERVICES PROJECTS AND FUNDED BY THE STATES USING THE SET-ASIDES DURING FISCAL YEARS 1979, 1980, AND 1981

Content Program, or Problem Area	Research	Exemplary and Innovative Programs	Curriculum Development	Vocational Guidance and Counseling	Vocational Education Personnel Training	Total
Staff Development	2	2	4	4	80	92
Support Services/ Community Resources	4	13	14	38	8	77
Methods and Materials	15	4	20	7	14	60
Career Development and Exploration	5	22	8	8	2	45
Limited English Proficiency/Bilingual Education	6	12	11	1	5	35
Vocational Assessment	4	9	0	12	7	32
Unidentified	1	10	8	4	3	26
Dissemination and Technical Assistance	6	8	1	3	7	25
Interagency Collaboration	3	1	1	6	11	22
Competency Based Vocational Education	0	0	11	0	9	20
Recruitment, Retention, Placement, and Follow-up	1	3	1	11	1	17
Dropouts and Potential Dropouts	0	3	10	2	1	16
Program Improvement and Planning	15	0	1	0	0	16
Program Evaluation	13	1	0	1	0	15
Needs Assessment	11	2	1	0	0	14
Basic Skills	2	2	6	1	3	14
Stereotyping/Non-traditional Occupations	3	0	0	10	0	13
Visual and Hearing Impaired	0	7	0	4	1	12
Special Populations (Emotionally Handicapped, Native Americans, Incarcerated, Blacks, and Parents)	0	5	1	1	5	12
Adult Vocational Services	1	2	2	3	1	9
Totals	92	106	100	116	158	572

N=57
n= 27 (states that funded at least one (1) project during the three-year period).

respect to student needs, individualizing instruction, and methods and procedures for mainstreaming special needs students into regular vocational programs.

Seventy-seven support services/community resources projects and activities were funded by the states and nearly 50% of these were within the vocational guidance and counseling area. Generally, these programs dealt with identifying, accessing, and evaluating the necessary supplementary school and community services students need to be successful in vocational programs and in transition to employment.

Methods and materials was also a high priority area. Many projects focused on research, curriculum development, and personnel training. Generally, the projects were concerned with the modification of existing or development of new teaching methods and instructional materials to meet the individual learning needs of handicapped and disadvantaged learners. Some attention was focused on training personnel in the development and use of appropriate methods and materials.

Career development and exploration in terms of the development and implementation of vocational awareness, orientation, and exploration programs, particularly at the secondary level, was the focus of 45 projects. Many of these were funded under exemplary and innovative programs including the development or modification of exploratory technical courses and skill training programs designed for special needs learners who previously have had limited program options and career alternatives.

In summary, 27 of the 57 states have used their handicapped and disadvantaged set-aside funds to support 572 program improvement and support services activities during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981. Vocational education personnel training projects were most frequently

funded while research projects were least frequently funded. Personnel preparation, support services, instructional methods and materials, and career development and exploration projects and activities represented nearly half of the projects funded during the three-year period.

Objective IV: Identify several program improvement projects and develop abstracts.

The number of projects, program descriptions (or abstracts) submitted, and abstracts developed (or edited) by program improvement areas are presented in Table 12. Two hundred and eighty-five (285) program descriptions and abstracts were submitted by the RCU directors from the 572 projects that they listed on the surveys. However, 22 of the 27 states which funded at least one project during the three-year period submitted all the program descriptions. The low return in some states was attributable to program descriptions being unavailable. In some cases, the RCU directors or their staffs were under time constraints and could not assemble or develop the abstracts. In other states, the directors did not have adequate staff or any staff to assign to this task.

Fifty of the 285 program descriptions submitted by the directors were selected for the purpose of developing abstracts. When a state provided program descriptions or abstracts for every program improvement area, one abstract was developed for each of the five areas. The projects identified by means of the abstracts were not selected on specific evaluative criteria, but rather on diversity and on overall breadth of topics from the available program descriptions by program improvement area. Therefore, a representative sample of program improvement projects funded with the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-asides

during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981 were selected and abstracts developed. These are presented in Appendix D.

TABLE 12

NUMBER OF PROJECTS, PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS SUBMITTED, AND ABSTRACTS DEVELOPED BY PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT AREAS

Program Improvement Area	Abstracts Developed	Program Descriptions Submitted	Total Projects Funded
Research	5	57	92
Exemplary and Innovative Programs	12	82	106
Curriculum Development	7	44	100
Vocational Guidance and Counseling	4	42	116
Vocational Education Personnel Training	22	60	158
Total	50	285	572

N = 27
n = 22

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which the 50 states, District of Columbia, and the trust territories (American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and Virgin Islands) have used their 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds provided by Public Law 94-482 to support program improvement projects and activities. In order to examine the central problem more closely, the research, exemplary and innovative programs, curriculum development, vocational guidance and counseling, and vocational education personnel training projects funded during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981 were identified. Further, the federal set-aside and matching state and local funding levels of the projects were also determined. The specific content, program, and problem areas addressed by the projects were identified and a compendium of program improvement project abstracts was developed. A five-item survey instrument was developed to achieve the major objectives and answer the research questions of this study. The entire population of 57 state research coordinating unit (RCU) directors was chosen to participate. After the initial mail survey and subsequent mail and telephone follow-up surveys, the final response rate was 100%. The data analysis process included the development of descriptive data tables and a discussion of the findings.

It was not the intent of this study to identify and examine all the projects and activities the states funded that impacted upon handicapped and disadvantaged learners. Only those projects, programs, or activities funded in part or whole with the handicapped and disadvantaged set-aside

funds were identified. Further, this study did not attempt to assess the effectiveness of the projects, nor to determine the levels or focus of funding of basic grants to LEAs. The findings are based on the major objectives and research questions developed for this study. The general findings of this study were:

1. Twenty-five of the 57 states and territories funded at least one research project with the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981; while a total of 92 projects were funded. A total of $4,609,825 of combined federal set-aside and matching state and local funds was used to fund research projects during the three-year period by the 23 states reporting data. The federal set-asides represented the largest portion of funding and the state funds the smallest funding source. Most states funded research projects with only the federal set-asides.

2. Twenty-two of the 57 states and territories funded at least one exemplary and innovative program project with the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981; while a total of 106 projects were funded. A total of $5,932,805 of combined federal set-aside and matching state and local funds was used to fund exemplary and innovative program projects during the three-year period by the 18 states reporting data. Most states used the federal set-asides to fund the major part of or entire projects while the state and local funds were relatively less used.

3. Twenty-one of the 57 states and territories funded at least one

curriculum development project with the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981; while a total of 100 projects were funded. A total of $4,672,204 of combined federal set-aside and matching state and local funds was used to fund curriculum development projects during the three-year period by the 18 states reporting data. Most states funded projects in part or whole with only the federal set-asides.

4. Nineteen of the 57 states and territories funded at least one vocational guidance and counseling project with the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-asides during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981; while a total of 116 projects were funded. Sixty-seven percent of all the projects were funded by three states. A total of $5,948,185 of combined federal set-aside and matching state and local funds was used to fund vocational guidance and counseling projects during the three-year period by the 14 states reporting data. The projects were funded minimally with state funds while the federal set-aside was the largest funding source. In addition, local funds represented a substantial portion of funding for some of the projects.

5. Twenty-seven of the 57 states and territories funded at least one vocational education personnnel training project with the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981; while a total of 158 projects were funded. Sixty percent of all the projects were funded by six states. A total of $5,662,734 of combined federal set-aside

and matching state and local funds was used to fund vocational education personnel training projects during the three-year period by the 24 states reporting data. Most states funded projects with only federal set-asides while state funds were minimally used.

6. A total of 572 program improvement and support services projects were funded with the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-asides by the 27 states which funded at least one project or activity during the three-year period. Vocational education personnel training projects were most frequently funded while research projects were least frequently funded. Approximately 50% of all the projects and activities funded dealt with the topics of personnel preparation, support services, instructional methods and materials, and career development and exploration.

Conclusions

The conclusions, based on the findings of this study, are concerned with the extent to which the states have used their 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged federal set-asides and matching state and local funds to support program improvement projects and activities in the areas of research, exemplary and innovative programs, curriculum development, vocational guidance and counseling, and vocational education personnel training.

1. Most states and territories did not use their 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-asides to fund program improvement

projects and activities. However, 47% of the states funded at least one project or activity during fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981.

2. Vocational education personnel training projects were most frequently funded while research projects were least frequently funded.

3. A small number of states funded a large percentage of all the projects.

4. One-half of all the program improvement projects and activities funded focused on the topics of personnel preparation, support services/community resources, instructional methods and materials, and career development and exploration.

5. The states used their federal handicapped and disadvantaged set-asides to fund the largest portion of the projects and activities while the projects were least funded with state funds.

6. Most states funded projects with only federal set-aside funds.

7. Those states which did not use their set-asides to support program improvement projects and activities apparently used the funds for basic grants to local education agencies (several RCU directors indicated this on their surveys) to support the excess costs for providing vocational instruction and support services to handicapped and disadvantaged learners.

8. Many states may fund several Subpart 3 (Program Improvement and Support Services) projects which include special needs as

well as non-special needs students. Thus, it is difficult to determine the full extent of funds expended for special needs learners under Subpart 3. Generally, these projects serving a combination of students are not counted against the 10% and 20% special needs set-asides.

Recommendations

The findings and conclusions of this study indicated that the 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds were not generally used by most states to fund program improvement programs and activities. Although several special needs national and statewide needs assessment, evaluation, and policy studies (Davis and Ward, 1978; Howard, 1979; Phelps and Thornton, 1979; Greenan and Phelps, 1980) have indicated a need for expanded program improvement initiatives in areas such as interagency cooperation and program evaluation, many states apparently are not using part of their set-asides for these purposes. This does not necessarily suggest that the states have not funded program improvement activities which impacted upon special needs learners, nor that the set-asides have not been appropriately used as basic grants to LEAs to support the excess costs of educating handicapped and disadvantaged students in vocational education. However, as handicapped and disadvantaged learners continue to be placed in regular vocational programs, it will become increasingly important to develop improved programs and services which assist them in succeeding in their programs and making the transition to the world of work.

Several general and specific recommendations can be made based on the findings and conclusions of this study. The recommendations which

follow are addressed to research and development, policy making, and planning personnel at the federal, state, and local levels.

1. This study specifically examined the extent to which the states have used their 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged funds to support program improvement projects and activities. However, it is recommended that further studies examine all the funding sources which the states use to fund program improvement projects that impact upon special needs learners in vocational education. For example, studies could be conducted to determine all projects funded with Public Law 94-482 Subpart 3 funds which directly impact on special needs learners. In addition, Public Law 94-142, Part B, funds could also be investigated.

2. States need to continue or begin to respond to the existing information and data which have been provided by national and statewide needs assessments and evaluations with respect to special populations. Program improvement activities should be funded based on the assessed needs of different target groups which are concerned with improving and expanding vocational education opportunities for special needs learners. SEA personnel (state directors of vocational and special education, state consultants for vocational special needs (handicapped and disadvantaged), RCU directors, and other staff), LEA personnel (administrators, supervisors, teachers, teacher aides, and other staff), teacher educators, parents and advocacy groups, and significant others should have input into assessing program

improvement needs, program inservice needs, and personnel needs (can be concurrent activities). Formal needs assessments can provide valid evidence for decision making and fiscal accountability.

Several agencies and programs (e.g., Leadership Training Institute/Vocational and Special Education at the University of Illinois, Minnesota Research and Development Center for Vocational Education at the University of Minnesota, National Inservice Network at Indiana University, Evaluation Training Consortium at Western Michigan University, and the National Center for Research in Vocational Education at The Ohio State University) have been working on vocational/special education needs assessment for several years and are available resources for persons who want to develop instrumentation, strategies, and procedures for assessing their states' needs.

3. States should create regional and/or national dissemination networks to share the special needs program improvement projects which they are funding. National organizations such as the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, Research Section; American Vocational Education Research Association; or the National Association of Vocational Education Special Needs Personnel could take the leadership in developing such networks. One example of such a network is the "Consortium for Research Related to the Career Development of Special Populations." The Consortium includes the vocational and special education personnel from the "BIG TEN" universities

who are involved in research related to special needs learners. Through an interagency collaborative network, research programs and activities are shared and conducted. Networks could take other forms such as a "clearinghouse" located at a college or university; or a periodic newsletter or directory of abstracts compiled, produced, and disseminated through a contracted private or public agency. Other alternatives could be to use existing dissemination linkages or systems such as the ERIC Clearinghouse or the National Center for Research in Vocational Education. The development of a dissemination network is very desirable since it could facilitate the sharing of program improvement information and assist states in the non-duplication of programs and activities.

4. A follow-up to this study could examine the methods and procedures by which states have funded, are funding, and will, in the future fund program improvement projects. The information obtained from such a study could provide state education agencies with alternatives for assessing needs, prioritizing needs, and efficiently using their existing funds. Effective state funding and allocation policies will become more significant as federal funding policies and resources become less prevalent in the states.

5. Future research should investigate the effectiveness of the projects or their impact (short-term and long-term, intended and unintended) on special needs learners. Program improvement activities are relatively costly to conduct. As funds

become more scarce and the need for fiscal accountability and efficiency becomes increasingly important, the states will have to demonstrate appropriate use of available local, state, and federal dollars. Evaluation questions including the following could be asked: As a result of the programs and activities, how many additional students are being served? How successful are students in their vocational programs and in the world of work? How effective are teachers in working with special needs students after receiving personnel training? How appropriate are the support services and curriculums available to students? These and other questions need to be asked to justify and validate the utility of future program improvement activities.

6. Future research studies could examine the states' funding policies regarding basic grants to LEAs. Studies could examine: how needs are determined, the formulas used to allocate funds, specific areas in which funds are used, the adequacy of funds relative to assessed needs, and the cost-effectiveness/benefits of the basic grants. Similar studies could provide valid evidence to state and federal funding agencies relative to future funding priorities.

7. Vocational education, special education, vocational rehabilitation, CETA, and other private and public agencies which serve handicapped and disadvantaged populations and use federal, state, and local funds to support program improvement activities need to develop effective interagency cooperation and funding

agreements. Collaborative efforts between agencies will assist in eliminating duplicative efforts and lead to increased fiscal efficiency. State education agency personnel (e.g., RCU directors, state directors of special education, state directors of vocational rehabilitation) could develop cooperative needs assessments and funding policies, and identify common program improvement activities. The first steps in developing cooperative agreements should be to define roles and responsibilities and determine how each agency can best contribute to each activity.

The Leadership Training Institute (LTI)/Vocational and Special Education at the University of Illinois and the Interagency Linkage Model Project at the University of Wisconsin-Madison continue to work with state education agencies in developing effective state level interagency cooperation and agreements. The LTI has conducted a policy study and compiled a compendium of interagency agreements which were developed and implemented in the states. In addition, the LTI has worked with state leadership personnel and has provided training in developing collaborative agreements among state agencies. The University of Wisconsin-Madison has worked intensively with states to develop effective interagency agreements. The interagency efforts of both these programs are applicable to developing state level program improvement collaborative activities. State education agency personnel should consult these and other similar programs for assistance and direction in interagency activities.

In summary, the funding of program improvement activities is an important part of providing handicapped and disadvantaged learners with expanded vocational education and employment opportunities. However, local, state, and federal funds to support these activities are likely to become more scarce as federal funding policies change and control of the dollars shifts to the LEAs. Therefore, future state funding policies should reflect increased collaboration among vocational education, special education, vocational rehabilitation, CETA, and other public and private agencies. Cooperation and agreements should be developed in such areas as needs assessments, funding methods and procedures, program evaluation, dissemination networks, and funding sources and allocations. Program improvement will flourish if state education agencies recognize federal policy changes and begin to develop effective strategies to meet the needs of their handicapped and disadvantaged special populations with potentially less funds and funding sources.

References

Abt Corporation. The Abt Study of State and Local Compliance and Evaluation Practice: Special Needs Populations. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, California, April 14, 1981.

Budke, W. E. and Magisos, J. H. Vocational Education Program Improvement: A Summary of State Administered Projects in FY 1978 and 1979. Columbus: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1980.

Davis, S. and Ward, M. Vocational Education of Handicapped Students: A Guide for Policy Development. Reston, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children, 1978.

Federal Register, Vocational Education, Volume 42, Number 67, April, 1977.

Federal Register, Non-discrimination on Basis of Handicap. Volume 42, Number 86, May 4, 1977. (Regulations for Implementing Section 504 of Public Law 93-112).

Federal Register, Education of Handicapped Children. Volume 42, Number 63, August 23, 1977. (Regulations for Implementing Public Law 94-142).

Greenan, J. P. and Phelps, L. A. Policy-Related Problems for Delivering Vocational Education to Handicapped Learners as Perceived by State Education Agency Personnel. Urbana, Illinois: Leadership Training Institute/Vocational and Special Education, 1980.

Howard, R. Vocational Education of Handicapped Youth: State of the Art. Washington, D. C.: National Association of State Boards of Education, 1979.

Phelps, L. A. and Thornton, L. J. Vocational Education and Handicapped Learners: Perceptions and Inservice Needs of State Leadership Personnel. Urbana, Illinois: Leadership Training Institute/Vocational and Special Education, 1979.

Appendix

Appendix A

Program Improvement and Support Services

Special Needs Project Survey

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____

_____

Telephone Number: ( ) _____

Example

Vocational Education Personnel Training

① Fiscal Year	② Project Title		Funding ③ Local	④ State	⑤ Federal	⑥ Total
1980	1. Personnel Preparation in Teaching Handicapped Learners in Vocational Education		$1000	$2000	$3000	$6000
	2. Non-Categorical Vocational/Special Education Teacher Programs		1000	2000	1500	4500
		⑦ Total	$2000	$4000	$4500	$10500

Instructions

1. The Fiscal Year is given.
2. Project Title - List all projects that are being funded with the set-asides for special needs learners in the appropriate fiscal year.
3. Local Funding - Indicate the amount of local funds in terms of dollars that are used to fund the project.
4. State Funding - Indicate the amount of state funds in terms of dollars that are used to fund the project.
5. Federal Funding - Indicate the amount of federal funds in terms of dollars that are used to fund the project.
6. Total - Add the local, state, and federal funds used for an individual project and record the sum.
7. Total - Add the local, state, and federal funds separately across projects and record the sums.

Research

Fiscal Year	Project Title	Funding			
		Local	State	Federal	Total
FY 1979					
	Total				
FY 1980					
	Total				
FY 1981					
	Total				

Exemplary and Innovative Programs

Fiscal Year	Project Title	Funding			
		Local	State	Federal	Total
FY 1979					
	Total				
FY 1980					
	Total				
FY 1981					
	Total				

Curriculum Development

Fiscal Year	Project Title	Funding			
		Local	State	Federal	Total
FY 1979					
	Total				
FY 1980					
	Total				
FY 1981					
	Total				

Vocational Guidance and Counseling

Fiscal Year	Project Title	Funding			
		Local	State	Federal	Total
FY 1979					
	Total				
FY 1980					
	Total				
FY 1981					
	Total				

Vocational Education Personnel Training

Fiscal Year	Project Title	Funding			
		Local	State	Federal	Total
FY 1979					
	Total				
FY 1980					
	Total				
FY 1981					
	Total				

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

College of Education
DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL
AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

345 Education Building
1310 S. Sixth Street
Champaign, IL 61820
(217) 333-0807

Appendix B

October 15, 1980

Dear RCU Director:

A major thrust in vocational education has been to provide special needs learners with appropriate instruction and support services. Public Law 94-482 (The Education Amendments of 1976 - Title II: Vocational Education, Part A) has provided federal set-aside funds specifically for the vocational education of special needs learners (10% handicapped, 20% disadvantaged). Subpart 3 (Program Improvement and Support Services) lists, defines, and describes the areas, in which set-aside funds may be used for program improvement projects and activities. These areas include:

- Research (Section 131)
- Exemplary and Innovative Programs (Section 132)
- Curriculum Development (Section 133)
- Vocational Guidance and Counseling (Section 134)
- Vocational Education Personnel Training (Section 135)

The Leadership Training Institute/Vocational and Special Education staff at the University of Illinois, is currently conducting a policy study to determine the extent to which the states have and are presently using their 10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged set-aside funds to support program improvement projects and activities that impact upon special needs learners in vocational education. In addition, a compendium of selected project abstracts will be developed. This study will describe the various program improvement thrusts that states have initiated regarding special needs learners.

Enclosed are five Subpart 3, program improvement and support services project surveys. Please complete each of the surveys by listing all projects within the five areas that are currently or have been funded with the set-asides for special needs learners on the appropriate surveys. If all the Subpart 3, program improvement areas are not under your supervision (e.g., research but not exemplary programs), please assist us by collecting and reporting that information from the appropriate section. Also, write your name, address, and telephone number on the cover sheet. You may want to refer to the example and instructions in completing the surveys.

In addition, please include an abstract for each project listed on the surveys. This will give us a more detailed description of the projects' goals, major objectives, target audiences, products, and other pertinent information. After reviewing the abstracts received, we will again contact you regarding permission to include specific abstracts in the final report.

We would appreciate it if you would return the completed cover sheet, five project lists, and abstracts by November 15, 1980. If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact us at (217)333-2325. Through this study and your cooperation we hope to identify and share the broad range of unique projects being initiated within the states to improve and expand vocational education for special needs learners. Your assistance in this effort is greatly appreciated!

Sincerely,

James P. Greenan, Ph.D.
Research and Development Coordinator
Leadership Training Institute/
Vocational and Special Education

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

College of Education
DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL
AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

345 Education Building
1310 S. Sixth Street
Champaign, IL 61820
(217) 333-0807

Appendix C

November 21, 1980

Dear RCU Director:

Five weeks ago you received a request from us to complete five Subpart 3 program improvement and support services project surveys. To be listed were all projects within the five areas (see surveys) that are currently or have been funded in your state with the set-asides (10% handicapped and 20% disadvantaged) for special needs learners on the appropriate surveys. Also to be included was an abstract for each project listed on the surveys.

We have enclosed copies of the materials that were previously mailed to you. It would be appreciated if you would complete the surveys and return them to us by December 21, 1980. If you have any questions, don't hesitate to contact us at (217)333-2325. Your cooperation and assistance in this effort is greatly appreciated! Thank you.

Sincerely,

James P. Greenan, Ph.D.
Research and Development Coordinator
Leadership Training Institute/
Vocational and Special Education

Appendix D

Program Improvement Project Abstracts

RESEARCH

STATE: Arkansas FISCAL YEAR: 1980

SPONSORING AGENCY: Fort Smith Public Schools TOTAL FUNDS: $39,740

CONTACT PERSON: Mrs. Betty Morris

ADDRESS: Fort Smith Public Schools
Fort Smith, Arkansas

PROJECT TITLE: Career Awareness and Job Placement for Early School Leavers and Adults in Fort Smith, Arkansas

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The major goals of this program are: (1) to develop a school-community plan of action for coordinating meaningful educational and occupational experiences for potential and actual early school leavers, and (2) to explore strategies and alternative solutions for providing career guidance and job placement services to identified target groups.

STATE: Arkansas FISCAL YEAR: 1980

SPONSORING AGENCY: University of Central Arkansas TOTAL FUNDS: $32,074

CONTACT PERSON: Dr. Joseph Arn

ADDRESS: University of Central Arkansas
Conway, Arkansas 72032

PROJECT TITLE: Coordinated Career Education Curriculum Project

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The major goal of this project is to develop a well-planned Coordinated Career Education (cooperative education for handicapped and/or disadvantaged students) curriculum guide which will enable the coordinated career education teachers to provide the kind of learning experiences and opportunities for their students to achieve their educational objectives more effectively and efficiently.

STATE: Colorado

FISCAL YEAR: 1980

SPONSORING AGENCY: Not available

TOTAL FUNDS: Not available

CONTACT PERSON: Not available

ADDRESS: Not Available

PROJECT TITLE: Assessing the Impact of Vocational Education Programs on Disadvantaged and Handicapped Students

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The major goals of this project are to assess the following: (1) numbers of handicapped and disadvantaged in Colorado, (2) identification of vocational needs, (3) the existence of current programs, (4) the adequacy of existing programs, (5) mainstreaming impact upon regular vocational programs, (6) training needs of vocational teachers, (7) career education/guidance needs, and (8) future directions of vocational programming.

STATE: Florida

FISCAL YEAR: 1980

SPONSORING AGENCY: University of Florida

TOTAL FUNDS: $15,000

CONTACT PERSON: Dr. Stuart Schwartz

ADDRESS: University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32611

PROJECT TITLE: A Study to Explore Vocational Training Programs and Subsequent Success of Handicapped Individuals in Rural Areas

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Available research literature provides little insight related to the vocational preparation and success of handicapped persons in rural areas. Observations and pilot studies conducted by the writers of this proposal in rural districts in the State of Florida indicate that few handicapped individuals can be considered vocationally successful. Given the current state of affairs, this project will be conducted to achieve the following objectives: (1) to develop and meet with a statewide advisory committee for this project, (2) to review the literature to determine the national state-of-the-art of vocational preparation programs for handicapped students and compare national models to those identified in Florida, and (3) to review the literature to determine the national state-of-the-art of vocational adult adjustment of handicapped and non-handicapped persons, particularly as it relates to rural settings.

STATE: Pennsylvania

FISCAL YEAR: 1979

SPONSORING AGENCY: Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit

TOTAL FUNDS: $40,893

CONTACT PERSON: Dr. Patrick F. Toole

ADDRESS: P.O. Box 213
Lewisburg, Pennsylvania 17837

PROJECT TITLE: Vocational Education Needs of Handicapped Youth Project

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This project, which is concerned with the identification of vocational preparation programming factors that may affect the performance and successful outcomes of handicapped students, has the following objectives: (1) to determine the current state-of-the-art relative to vocational education programs offered to handicapped students by vocational education schools, home schools, and various local community programs through the development and administration of an inventory, (2) to identify and develop evaluation criteria to be employed in the research project, (3) to develop research methodology, (4) to expand the information base on program options, and (5) to establish an advisory committee.

EXEMPLARY AND INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS

STATE: Arizona

FISCAL YEAR: 1981

SPONSORING AGENCY: Mohare County School District

TOTAL FUNDS: $92,265

CONTACT PERSON: David Watson

ADDRESS: 515 West Beale
Kingman, Arizona 86401

PROJECT TITLE: Seeking Alternative Vocational Education

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This program is designed to provide a thorough vocational education training and support program for young people who may or who have already dropped out of the regular school system prior to graduation. The major goals of the program will be: (1) to increase the chance for success of potential dropouts by keeping them in school through providing appropriate vocational education programming, and (2) for dropouts to enhance their chances for successful employment by training and/or job placement.

STATE: Florida

FISCAL YEAR: 1981

SPONSORING AGENCY: Florida State University

TOTAL FUNDS: $10,000

CONTACT PERSON: Dr. Hollie B. Thomas

ADDRESS: Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

PROJECT TITLE: A Study to Identify the Unique Criteria and Standards Needed for the Development of Successful Bilingual Vocational Education Programs

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The proposed research intends to identify the unique criteria and standards needed for the development of successful bilingual vocational education programs. The major objectives are: (1) to identify the unique staff requirements for working with students of limited-English speaking ability; (2) to identify the unique facilities, equipment, and materials needed for the instruction of such students; (3) to identify the unique curriculum components that are needed, and (4) to identify cultural and philosophical differences that exist between the students, teachers, and the dominant population.

STATE: Florida

FISCAL YEAR: 1981

SPONSORING AGENCY: Florida International University

TOTAL FUNDS: $41,689

CONTACT PERSON: Debbie Herman Seigel

ADDRESS: Florida International University
Tamiami Trail
Miami, Florida 33199

PROJECT TITLE: Handicapped User Interface for Florida VIEW

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project will augment Florida's VIEW Career Information for relevance to physically handicapped users. The major objectives are: (1) to collect physical capacities information, using the Job Related Physical Capacities (JRPC) job analysis method, on at least 40 occupations on FLORIDA VIEW, (2) to produce this data in appropriate format to be included directly on VIEW microfiche, and (3) to refine the JRPC user's manual for use with FLORIDA VIEW.

STATE: Idaho

FISCAL YEAR: 1980

SPONSORING AGENCY: Nampa School District

TOTAL FUNDS: $10,000

CONTACT PERSON: Marjorie Wesche

ADDRESS: Nampa Senior High School
Nampa, Idaho 83651

PROJECT TITLE: Nutrition for Disadvantaged

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The major goals of this project are: (1) to improve the nutrition of high school economically disadvantaged students through study and teaching elementary pupils, (2) to improve the nutrition of the K-5 pupils in Centennial Elementary School through classroom unit teaching, and (3) to acquaint high school students with nutritional job opportunities.

STATE: Illinois FISCAL YEAR: 1980

SPONSORING AGENCY: Joliet Township District #204 TOTAL FUNDS: $69,118

CONTACT PERSON: Tom Boldrey

ADDRESS: 201 E. Jefferson Street
Joliet, Illinois 60432

PROJECT TITLE: Diffusion Center for Exemplary Occupational Education Programs for Handicapped and Disadvantaged Students

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The major goals of this project are: (1) to serve as a diffusion center for exemplary occupational education activities that serve the vocational education needs of handicapped and disadvantaged students at the secondary level; (2) to actively participate in the coordination and diffusion of exemplary occupational education activities operating in Joliet and in the other specified sites by working closely with all sites in the network and the Illinois State University center; (3) to provide technical assistance on a one-to-one basis to selected school districts who are interested in adapting/adopting one or more of the programs, services and/or materials that relate to occupational education for handicapped and disadvantaged students; and (4) to strengthen existing programs, services, and staff competencies in relationship to occupational education for all handicapped and disadvantaged students in District 204.

STATE: Kentucky FISCAL YEAR: 1981

SPONSORING AGENCY: Western Kentucky University TOTAL FUNDS: $39,143

CONTACT PERSON: Dr. Norma Jean Schira

ADDRESS: Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky 42101

PROJECT TITLE: Assessment of Occupational Opportunities in Health Occupations for Handicapped

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The major goals of this project are: (1) to assess and identify the types of occupational programs in health occupations available to handicapped students, (2) to prepare a catalog of opportunities according to handicap classifications with suggestions about modifications, (3) to prepare and package for field testing

instructional materials for special needs students, and (4) to provide inservice to health occupations teachers in the strategies used with special needs students.

STATE: Massachusetts

FISCAL YEAR: 1981

SPONSORING AGENCY: Ecumenical Social Action Committee

TOTAL FUNDS: $70,002

CONTACT PERSON: Not available

ADDRESS: Not available

PROJECT TITLE: Pre-Vocational Program for High Risk Adolescents

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The major goals of this project are: (1) to couple traditional school involvement with vocational exploration through activities such as individual and group counseling, field trips, internships, family outreach counseling, and other supportive services; (2) to provide meaningful age-appropriate center exploration/work opportunities; and (3) to expose clients to non-traditional career options.

STATE: Minnesota

FISCAL YEAR: 1980

SPONSORING AGENCY: Red Wing AVTI

TOTAL FUNDS: $24,864

CONTACT PERSON: Pat Enz

ADDRESS: Red Wing AVTI
Red Wing, Minnesota 55066

PROJECT TITLE: PLATO - (Phase III)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The major goals of this project are: (1) to provide students with a variety of skills to comprehend concepts, (2) to provide complex interaction opportunities through dialogue mode of PLATO, (3) to provide new experiences in a variety of subjects related to the student program, and (4) to individually assist students in developing skills necessary to obtain success in their program area.

STATE: New Jersey

FISCAL YEAR: 1980

SPONSORING AGENCY: Middlesex County Vocational-Technical High School

TOTAL FUNDS: $5,875

CONTACT PERSON: Brian Laughlin

ADDRESS: Burr D. Coe Vo-Tec
112 Rues Lane
East Brunswick, New Jersey 08816

PROJECT TITLE: Optimizing Vocational Development in the Handicapped (A Systems Approach to Community and Family Involvement)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Using the theory that interaction between community, family, and school is crucial to an individual's eventual success in the competitive job market, this project sought to bring together all three interrelated social systems for the purpose of developing realistic vocational plans for participating handicapped students.

STATE: New Mexico

FISCAL YEAR: 1981

SPONSORING AGENCY: Career Services for the Handicapped

TOTAL FUNDS: Not Available

CONTACT PERSON: Chris Isengard

ADDRESS: 620 Roma, N.W., Suite B
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87103

PROJECT TITLE: Vocational Support for the Severely Handicapped

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The objectives of this project are: (1) to provide supportive services necessary to allow severely, physically, and sensory handicapped students to attend established vocational programs; and (2) to provide supportive services to severely physically, and sensory handicapped persons during periods of on-the-job training and job orientation.

STATE: New York

FISCAL YEAR: 1979

SPONSORING AGENCY: Kennedy High School

TOTAL FUNDS: $231,365

CONTACT PERSON: Not available

ADDRESS: Bronx, New York

PROJECT TITLE: Occupational Education for Disadvantaged Secondary Students

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Kennedy High School offers an unusual alternative in the Voluntary/Work Experience Program by blending academic and work experiences. It focuses on in-depth exploration and decision making, skills acquisition, and basic learning through full-time, individualized and realistic site experiences. Three hundred disadvantaged students in grades 10-12 are served in photography, arts, and graphics based upon predetermined selection criteria.

STATE: Texas

FISCAL YEAR: 1981

SPONSORING AGENCY: Region XX - ESC

TOTAL FUNDS: $50,000

CONTACT PERSON: Dwain M. Ester

ADDRESS: 1550 N.E. Loop 410
San Antonio, Texas 78209

PROJECT TITLE: Vocational Assessment for the Handicapped

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The objectives of this project are: (1) to develop a training program for LEA personnel in the administration and interpretation of selected vocational evaluation instruments; (2) to evaluate 50 handicapped students and in so doing refine the process of evaluation procedures, forms, selection of tests, reports, and others; (3) to provide technical assistance in programming for the handicapped; and (4) to gather data through research on the use of dexterity tests in differentiating mentally retarded, learning disabled, and normal high school students.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

STATE: Arizona

FISCAL YEAR: 1981

SPONSORING AGENCY: MCCCD (Rio Salado)

TOTAL FUNDS: $29,604

CONTACT PERSON: Dr. Martha Martin

ADDRESS: 102 North 40th Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85034

PROJECT TITLE: One Step Further: Guadalupe

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This program will provide students with remedial basic education and occupational skills necessary to maintain a small business. Its goals are: (1) to develop the skills necessary to make students independent entrepreneurs, (2) to enable them to govern their own guild, and (3) to prepare them to succeed in community college or other formal occupational programs.

STATE: Illinois

FISCAL YEAR: 1981

SPONSORING AGENCY: Southern Illinois University

TOTAL FUNDS: $29,931

CONTACT PERSON: Mr. E. Hollis Merritt

ADDRESS: School of Technical Careers
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

PROJECT TITLE: Development of Multi-Cultural Competency-Based Vocational/Technical Curricula

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The major goals of this project are: (1) to reduce linguistic and cultural barriers to learning among limited English speaking adults (LESAs) involved in vocational/technical training programs in eight occupational areas and (2) to improve vocational instruction through the development of bilingual (Pocho speaking and Laotian speaking LESAs, but with generic applications to other vocational/technical training needs involving Spanish speaking and other Indochinese speaking LESA groups) competency-based curricula in modules which will be used in eight high demand occupational areas (automobile body repair, automobile mechanic, building maintenance mechanic, combination welder, fiberglass technical, food service, machine trades, and secretarial/clerical).

STATE: Massachusetts

FISCAL YEAR: 1981

SPONSORING AGENCY: Fall River Public Schools

TOTAL FUNDS: $34,734

CONTACT PERSON: Not available

ADDRESS: Fall River Public Schools
Fall River, Massachusetts

PROJECT TITLE: Appliance Repair

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This project has as its major goal to provide additional staffing for the appliance repair program including two aides, one for 15 handicapped students and one for 30 limited English-proficiency students.

STATE: Minnesota

FISCAL YEAR: 1980

SPONSORING AGENCY: Duluth AVTI

TOTAL FUNDS: $2,459

CONTACT PERSON: Clifford Wiklund

ADDRESS: #709 - Duluth AVTI
Lake Avenue and 2nd Street
Duluth, Minnesota 55802

PROJECT TITLE: Chemical Dependency Curriculum Workshops for the AVTI's

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The major goals of this project are: (1) to satisfy the needs of the AVTIs for program implementation and staff training, (2) to increase their use of the services available, (3) to assist students who are experiencing problems in schools related to chemical dependency use/abuse, and (4) to introduce new and innovative curricula developed by the American Business Men's Research Foundation and the California Council on Alcohol Problems.

STATE: New Jersey

FISCAL YEAR: 1980

SPONSORING AGENCY: Burlington County College

TOTAL FUNDS: $31,159

CONTACT PERSON: D. Brian Lewis

ADDRESS: Social Sciences Division
Pemberton - Browns Mills Road
Pemberton, New Jersey 08068

PROJECT TITLE: Paraprofessional Training in Special Education

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The objectives of this project include: (1) to further develop, field-test, and disseminate a model curriculum; and (2) to provide preservice and inservice training to paraprofessionals in special education. The overall curriculum design, supportive materials for the first two courses, and the blueprint for a portable professional library were developed in a project funded in fiscal year 1978. In fiscal year 1979, the project addressed itself to developing the remaining supportive materials for the third and fourth courses and field testing all materials.

STATE: New Mexico

FISCAL YEAR: 1981

SPONSORING AGENCY: Northern New Mexico Community College

TOTAL FUNDS: Not available

CONTACT PERSON: Connie A. Valdez

ADDRESS: Northern New Mexico Community College
Espanola, New Mexico

PROJECT TITLE: Meeting Curriculum Needs of the Disadvantaged Students

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The objectives of this project are: (1) to provide curriculum which is tailored to the needs and abilities of the disadvantaged student with emphasis on basic skills, (2) to provide students with materials and instruction which will promote conceptual development and skill awareness, (3) to assist students in the development of competencies which will help them compete successfully in the labor market, and (4) to promote student success in vocational programs and thus decrease dropout rates.

STATE: Pennsylvania

FISCAL YEAR: 1979

SPONSORING AGENCY: School District of The City of Erie

TOTAL FUNDS: $23,980

CONTACT PERSON: Henry Pilker

ADDRESS: School District of the City of Erie
Erie, Pennsylvania 16501

PROJECT TITLE: An Adaptive Vocational Program for Trainable Retarded Students

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The objectives of this project which are designed to research the educational value of placing trainable retarded students in regular vocational shops, include: (1) to formulate IEPs based on parental, professional, and student attitudes toward the area that could best benefit the student; (2) to place students in various vocational shops that will benefit them in everyday self-help skills; and (3) acquaint the TMRs, regular students, and regular teachers with each other's characteristics.

VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING

STATE: Arizona

FISCAL YEAR: 1981

SPONSORING AGENCY: Nogales Unified School District #1

TOTAL FUNDS: $42,012

CONTACT PERSON: Dr. James Lehman

ADDRESS: 402 Martinez Street
Nogales, Arizona 85621

PROJECT TITLE: Special Needs: Limited English

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The major goals of this program are: (1) to help students who have been identified as dropouts or potential dropouts to increase their knowledge in basic communication skills, basic mathematics, and reading skills; and (2) to provide vocational guidance and counseling services which will help them in their academic and vocational pursuits after graduation.

STATE: Massachusetts

FISCAL YEAR: 1981

SPONSORING AGENCY: New Bedford Public Schools

TOTAL FUNDS: $134,458

CONTACT PERSON: Not available

ADDRESS: New Bedford Public Schools
New Bedford, Massachusetts

PROJECT TITLE: Career Orientation and Training

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This alternative occupational project has the following goals: (1) to deter students from dropping out of high school; (2) to significantly increase their opportunities for employment; and (3) to provide hands-on training in the areas of communications, construction, health services, manufacturing, and office occupations.

STATE: Oregon

FISCAL YEAR: 1980

SPONSORING AGENCY: David Douglas High School

TOTAL FUNDS: $38,741

CONTACT PERSON: Mr. Stan Gaumer

ADDRESS: David Douglas School District
1500 S.E. 130th Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97233

PROJECT TITLE: Career Center for Vocational Guidance

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The purpose of this project is to provide and coordinate student opportunities to explore, identify, and accumulate information that will pertain to individual skills and career goals. Its major goals are: (1) to provide career guidance services to disadvantaged and handicapped students; (2) to coordinate vocational guidance, work experience, and disadvantaged and handicapped services; (3) to reduce sex-role stereotyping; and (4) to create staff awareness of career center materials and functions.

STATE: New Jersey

FISCAL YEAR: 1980

SPONSORING AGENCY: Salem County Board for Vocational Education

TOTAL FUNDS: $18,500

CONTACT PERSON: Charles Lutz

ADDRESS: Road #2, Box 350
Woodstown, New Jersey 08098

PROJECT TITLE: Vocational Courses for Handicapped Adults

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The primary goal of this project was to train handicapped and disadvantaged adults, other than those in need of sheltered workshop facilities, to fill semi-skilled positions, particularly in the service fields.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL TRAINING

STATE: Arizona

FISCAL YEAR: 1981

SPONSORING AGENCY: Mesa Community College

TOTAL FUNDS: $105,738

CONTACT PERSON: Marilyn Seymann

ADDRESS: 1833 West Southern Avenue
Mesa, Arizona 85202

PROJECT TITLE: Project to Help Adults Acquire Special Education--PHASE II

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: To assure maximum vocational education training for an increasing number of students with special needs, MCC proposes to develop and implement an afternoon college for these individuals. The major goals of this program are: (1) to combine an on-site work experience in the mornings in a job-related setting along with an afternoon program of vocational studies, and (2) to operate this program in coordination with appropriate support services to provide an uninterrupted continuum from school to employment.

STATE: Arkansas

FISCAL YEAR: 1980

SPONSORING AGENCY: University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff

TOTAL FUNDS: Not available

CONTACT PERSON: Dr. James E. Jennings

ADDRESS: University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff
Pine Bluff, Arkansas

PROJECT TITLE: Develop and Field Test Modules for the Training of Teachers of Special Needs Students in Regular Vocational Education Programs

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The purpose of this project is to prepare vocational teachers and potential teachers to effectively teach students with special needs. More specifically, the project will facilitate the mainstreaming of students with special needs into the regular vocational programs through the following means: (1) to restructure selected teacher preparation courses in vocational areas to provide skills in working with special needs students, (2) to develop appropriate individualized learning opportunities for prospective teachers

of special needs students, (3) to provide inservice training of university faculty who will teach competency-based modules in selected courses, (4) to evaluate graduates of the preservice program, and (5) to provide training for selected teachers of special needs students.

STATE: Connecticut

FISCAL YEAR: 1981

SPONSORING AGENCY: Bureau of Pupil Personnel
Hartford, Connecticut

TOTAL FUNDS: $20,434

CONTACT PERSON: Stephen Feldman

ADDRESS: Special Education Department
Southern Connecticut State College
New Haven, Connecticut

PROJECT TITLE: Special Study Institute

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The major goals of this project are: (1) to train 40 special educators, regular educators, and school counseling personnel to jointly identify: (a) specific learning characteristics and training capabilities of handicapped adolescents; (b) existing legal and fiscal support mechanisms and options for vocational education, career education, and counseling; and (c) in-service training priorities for career, occupational, and vocational educators; and (2) to train 30 regular teachers, special educators, administrators, vocational counselors, social workers, and guidance counselors in the concepts of career and vocational education for the handicapped.

STATE: Idaho

FISCAL YEAR: 1980

SPONSORING AGENCY: University of Idaho

TOTAL FUNDS: $4,197

CONTACT PERSON: Dr. Jack Kaufman

ADDRESS: University of Idaho
Moscow, Idaho 83843

PROJECT TITLE: Communication Skills Development Workshop for Vocational Special Needs

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The major goals of this project are: (1) to develop a course to be offered to vocational special needs teachers throughout the state, and (2) to develop through this process a core of qualified affiliate faculty who will offer the course in various locations throughout the state.

STATE: Illinois

FISCAL YEAR: 1981

SPONSORING AGENCY: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

TOTAL FUNDS: $75,000

CONTACT PERSON: Dr. L. Allen Phelps

ADDRESS: 345 Education Building
Urbana, Illinois 61801

PROJECT TITLE: Development of a Programmatic Emphasis and Extern Program for Vocational Special Needs Education

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The major goals of this project are: (1) to organize and implement a university-based developmental model of programmatic emphasis on vocational special needs education; (2) to organize and implement a model for preparing special needs externs to provide inservice and technical assistance services to LEA's; and (3) to facilitate linkages between vocational education, special education, and vocational rehabilitation at the university, state education agency, and local levels.

STATE: Kentucky

FISCAL YEAR: 1980

SPONSORING AGENCY: Western Kentucky University

TOTAL FUNDS: $8,158

CONTACT PERSON: Susan Adams

ADDRESS: CCVTE
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky 42101

PROJECT TITLE: Resources and Assistance for Vocational Educators of Students with Limited English-Speaking Ability (LESA)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The major goals of this project are: (1) to continue assistance in equitable and appropriate program modifications to Kentucky vocational education programs serving LESA populations; (2) to continue provision of resources, information, and technical advisement to vocational educators serving LESA students; (3) to inform Kentucky vocational educators regarding federal mandates regulating recruitment and services for LESA students and encourage appropriate response; and (4) to monitor the number and type of Kentucky vocational programs serving LESA students.

STATE: Massachusetts

FISCAL YEAR: 1981

SPONSORING AGENCY: Westfield State College

TOTAL FUNDS: $70,200

CONTACT PERSON: Not available

ADDRESS: Not available

PROJECT TITLE: Recruitment and Training of Minority Vocational Instructors (Phase II)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This program will expand the existing project to train and recruit minority vocational instructors in western Massachusetts. Its major goals are: (1) to provide counseling and placement services for the current group of 25 trainees and (2) to train and place an additional group of 60 black and linguistic-minority trainees.

STATE: Minnesota

FISCAL YEAR: 1981

SPONSORING AGENCY: Duluth AVTI

TOTAL FUNDS: $37,609

CONTACT PERSON: Cliff Wiklund

ADDRESS: 2101 Trinity Road
Duluth, Minnesota 55802

PROJECT TITLE: The Provision of Occupational and Student Program Consultant Services for Chemical Dependency in Minnesota AVTIs

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This project has as its major goals: (1) to provide the necessary technical assistance and supplemental support to the individual AVTIs, (2) to design and implement a program which supports the AVTIs' efforts, (3) to respond to chemical-related problems of students, and (4) to assist in the development of inservice training programs for the staff.

STATE: Nebraska

FISCAL YEAR: 1980

SPONSORING AGENCY: University of Nebraska, Lincoln

TOTAL FUNDS: $3,996

CONTACT PERSON: Dr. Gary D. Meers

ADDRESS: Center for Business and Vocational Teacher Education
University of Nebraska, Lincoln
Lincoln, Nebraska

PROJECT TITLE: Inservice Training for the Instruction of Special Vocational Needs Students

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The major goal of this project is to provide an in-service workshop opportunity for educators in the state of Nebraska who are involved with instruction of special needs youth in vocational programs.

STATE: New Hampshire

FISCAL YEAR: 1981

SPONSORING AGENCY: University of New Hampshire

TOTAL FUNDS: $22,319

CONTACT PERSON: Stephen Lichtenstein

ADDRESS: University of New Hampshire

PROJECT TITLE: Instructing Educators in Providing Services for Disadvantaged Learners

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The objectives of this project are: (1) to develop and conduct preservice teacher preparation courses in vocational education for disadvantaged learners; (2) to develop and conduct inservice training for vocational administrators, teachers, and staff serving disadvantaged learners in a vocational education setting; and (3) to provide technical assistance and establish contact in the field of vocational education for disadvantaged learners to LEAs and other outside agencies (vocational rehabilitation, CETA, private schools, and others).

STATE: New Jersey

FISCAL YEAR: 1981

SPONSORING AGENCY: Jersey City State College

TOTAL FUNDS: Not available

CONTACT PERSON: George Voller

ADDRESS: 2039 Kennedy Boulevard
Jersey City, New Jersey 07305

PROJECT TITLE: Working Effectively with Special Needs Students

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This project's objectives included: (1) to share the expertise of special educators and vocational educators through conducting two one-day workshops; (2) to exchange information regarding improving instruction to special needs students by becoming familiar with federal legislation and state regulations regarding exceptional pupils in special needs programs; (3) to identify learning styles and characteristics of various handicapping conditions; (4) to present examples of model programs; and (5) to provide information on teaching vocationally related academics, implementing individual education programs, and modifying behavior.

STATE: New Mexico

FISCAL YEAR: 1981

SPONSORING AGENCY: New Mexico State University

TOTAL FUNDS: Not available

CONTACT PERSON: Dr. Jack T. Cole

ADDRESS: Department of Educational Specialties
Box 3AC
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88003

PROJECT TITLE: An Inservice Program for the Preparation of Vocational-Technical Educators to Work with Handicapped Students

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The objectives of this project include: (1) to develop a handicapped student inservice training curriculum for vocational-technical educators, (2) to offer 12 - 15 inservice training workshops, (3) to train participating vocational-technical educators in the various handicapping conditions, (4) to train participating vocational-technical educators in various teaching strategies that are effective with handicapped students, (5)

to disseminate training materials to all workshop participants, and (6) to make follow-up contacts with workshop participants.

STATE: Idaho FISCAL YEAR: 1981

SPONSORING AGENCY: University of Idaho TOTAL FUNDS: $6,443

CONTACT PERSON: A. Lee Parks

ADDRESS: University of Idaho
Moscow, Idaho 83843

PROJECT TITLE: A Procedural Manual Relating to Vocational Special Needs/ Special Education for Idaho

PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS: This project has as its major goal to prepare a procedures manual of secondary special education/needs programs in Idaho.

STATE: Illinois FISCAL YEAR: 1980

SPONSORING AGENCY: Illinois State University TOTAL FUNDS: $99,138

CONTACT PERSON: Dr. Catherine Batsche/Bessie Hackett

ADDRESS: Turner Hall
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois 61721

PROJECT TITLE: Handicapped and Disadvantaged Network: Coordination and Diffusion Project

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The major goals of this project are: (1) to coordinate statewide diffusion, inservice, and impact activities related to the Illinois Network of Exemplary Occupational Education Programs for Handicapped and Disadvantaged Students; (2) to conduct and coordinate workshops at local sites based on the manual Instructional Development For Special Needs Learners: An Inservice Resource Guide (Dr. L. Allen Phelps, author); (3) to prepare the audio-visual and printed materials necessary to complement diffusion activities, (4) to conduct a statewide conference on handicapped and disadvantaged students; (5) to provide intensive training for the Bloomington Area Vocational Center/High School administration and staff; and (6) to work cooperatively with Illinois State University staff to develop a plan of action for preservice relating to special needs students.

STATE: Oregon

FISCAL YEAR: 1980

SPONSORING AGENCY: Southwestern Oregon Community College

TOTAL FUNDS: $36,449

CONTACT PERSON: Richard White

ADDRESS: Southwestern Oregon Community College
Coos Bay, Oregon 97420

PROJECT TITLE: Emphasis on Sophomores

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The major goals of this project are: (1) to assist high school sophomores in clarifying career goals, (2) to familiarize interested students with a community college setting, (3) to provide high school counselors and students with more data on which to make curriculum decisions, (4) to evaluate the project carefully for further refinement and application, (5) to introduce participating high schools to a new guidance tool, and (6) to facilitate cooperative working relationships among participating high schools.

STATE: Oregon

FISCAL YEAR: 1980

SPONSORING AGENCY: Lane Community College

TOTAL FUNDS: $57,876

CONTACT PERSON: John Bernham

ADDRESS: Lane Community College
400 E. 30th Avenue
Eugene, Oregon 97405

PROJECT TITLE: Physically Disabled Services Project

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The purpose of this project is to provide improved specialized services for partially-sighted and blind students, students with hearing difficulties, and students with mobility and other disabilities. Its major goals are: (1) to provide specialized counseling for disabled individuals, student advocates, and outreach programs; and (2) to establish close liaison with other community agencies serving disabled people.

STATE: Kentucky

FISCAL YEAR: 1981

SPONSORING AGENCY: Western Kentucky University

TOTAL FUNDS: $34,235

CONTACT PERSON: Dr. Dwight Cline

ADDRESS: Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky 42101

PROJECT TITLE: Diagnostic and Prescriptive Skills Development for Vocational Educators

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The major goals of this project are: (1) to establish an advisory committee of special education, special vocational education, vocational education, guidance, administrative, and diagnostic personnel who will review the project developed products and participate in the planning and implementation of workshops; (2) to assess IEPs written for handicapped students enrolled in vocational programs in regard to compliance with P.L. 94-142, and identify specific areas in which vocational educators would profit from additional training; (3) to provide training and resources to improve the diagnostic and prescriptive skills of vocational educators of handicapped students; and (4) to develop a catalogue of assessment techniques and an accompanying handbook to help vocational teachers to identify and diagnose learning abilities and disabilities of handicapped students.

STATE: Massachusetts

FISCAL YEAR: 1980

SPONSORING AGENCY: Shawsheen Valley Regional Vocational Technical School

TOTAL FUNDS: $57,000

CONTACT PERSON: Not available

ADDRESS: Not available

PROJECT TITLE: Pre-Vocational Assessment

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This project is part of a statewide effort and has as its major goals: (1) to develop a reliable process and procedure that enhances the ability of local school districts to qualitatively assess special needs students if occupational education is being considered by the core evaluation team, and (2) to train school district personnel in this procedure once it has been developed.

STATE: Minnesota FISCAL YEAR: 1981

SPONSORING AGENCY: University of Minnesota TOTAL FUNDS: $6,095

CONTACT PERSON: Jerome Moss, Jr.

ADDRESS: Department of Vocational and Technical Education
145 Peik Hall, University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

PROJECT TITLE: Develop a System to Distribute Federal Funds to Minnesota AVTIs for Augmenting the Education of Special Needs Students

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The major goals of this project are: (1) to clearly delineate the domain of the problem as related to the total state/federal interface of set-aside funds, (2) to review related literature which impact the problem, (3) to develop guidelines for minimal special needs support services within the AVTIs, (4) to develop the process by which AVTIs obtain the funding to carry out the minimum special needs support services, (5) to seek input from an ad hoc advisory committee and obtain its approval, and (6) to acquire direction from the U.S. Department of Education and obtain its approval.

STATE: New Jersey FISCAL YEAR: 1980

SPONSORING AGENCY: Glassboro State College TOTAL FUNDS: $17,080

CONTACT PERSON: Ted Gustilo, Jr.
Coordinator of Research for Career Education

ADDRESS: Office of Career Education, Bossart 104
Glassboro State College
Glassboro, New Jersey 08028

PROJECT TITLE: Bilingual Translation of Revised Vocational English and Math Instructional Units

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The major goals of this project include: (1) to refine previously developed vocational curriculum materials that demonstrate the applications of language and mathematics skills to specific vocational areas, (2) to rescreen materials for sex-role stereotyping to assure that the revisions did not introduce sex bias, and (3) to translate the materials into Spanish to extend their usefulness to a large group of bilingual and Spanish speaking students who otherwise would not benefit from them.

STATE: New York

FISCAL YEAR: 1979

SPONSORING AGENCY: Oswego BOCES

TOTAL FUNDS: $50,000

CONTACT PERSON: Not available

ADDRESS: Mexico, New York

PROJECT TITLE: Regional Occupational Education Planning

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The objectives for this project include: (1) to develop a systematic process for annually gathering enrollment and follow-up data on students receiving occupational education at local high schools, (2) to develop a systematic process for annually gathering and analyzing data of students enrolled in adult and continuing education occupational preparation programs, and (3) to develop a more complete analysis of the current and projected job market in central New York detailing openings for employment and potential training needs.

STATE: Texas

FISCAL YEAR: 1981

SPONSORING AGENCY: University of Texas at Dallas

TOTAL FUNDS: $60,443

CONTACT PERSON: George W. Fair

ADDRESS: P.O. Box 688
Richardson, Texas 75080

PROJECT TITLE: Handicapped Students in Regular Vocational Education: Impact on Class Interaction and Instructional Variables

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The purpose of this project is to gather data pertinent to the instruction of special education students in regular vocational education programs. The objectives of the project include: (1) to observe and describe the handicapped student-vocational instructor interaction in regular vocational education programs, (2) to observe and describe the handicapped student-nonhandicapped student interaction in regular vocational education programs, (3) to describe the development and implementation of individualized education plans for handicapped students in regular vocational education programs, (4) to describe instructional adaptations and modifications that can be defined as excess costs for funding purposes, and (5) to develop recommendations for more effective instruction of handicapped students in regular vocational education programs.

"END OF DOCUMENT"